

REMARKS

Claims 15-25, 31, and 34-41 are pending in the present application. Claims 15-25 and 31 were previously withdrawn from consideration as drawn to a non-elected invention. By virtue of this response, claims 34, 35, and 38 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 34-41 are currently under consideration. Amendment and cancellation of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented.

Applicant notes that claims 39-41 were present prior to filing of the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) of May 17, 2007, and even if not entered prior to the RCE, should be pending as a result of the RCE. Claims 39-41 appear on PAIR. Applicant requests examination of claims 39-41, and appropriate correction of the file and record to properly reflect the pending claims. Applicant does not see any statement by the Examiner regarding claims 39-41. Therefore, if a rejection is made against the pending claims, and in particular independent claim 41 in the next action, the action must be non-final.

Claim Objections

Claim 34 stands objected to allegedly because of the following informalities:

In claim 34, line 8, "configuration," should be changed to --configuration; and--.
Appropriate correction is required.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the informality. Appropriate correction has been made.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Claims 34-35 and 37-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ladd et al. (U.S. Patent: 6,269,336, hereinafter Ladd) in view of Uppaluru (U.S. Patent: 5,915,001).

Claim 34 has been amended to recite “to match the received text string to pre-recorded prompt labels by searching only within the prompt class.” Applicant respectfully asserts that Ladd does not disclose or suggest matching the received text string to prompt labels by searching only within the prompt class, and the addition of Uppaluru does not cure the defects of Ladd.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Ladd does not disclose or suggest the prompt class of claim 34. Although Ladd uses the term “class”, Ladd’s class differs significantly from the prompt class of claim 1. In Ladd, the “CLASS element of the markup language (i.e., <CLASS NAME=’value’ [PARENT=’value’] [BARGEIN=’value’] [COST=’value’]> text </CLASS>) is used to define a set of elements that are to be reused within the content of a dialog.” (Ladd, col. 31, lines 54-58). In contrast, claim 34 recites “a prompt class in which to match the received text string to a text string occurrence” and “to match the received text string to pre-recorded prompt labels by searching only within the prompt class.” Applicant respectfully asserts that Ladd does not disclose or suggest a prompt class in which to match the received text string to pre-recorded prompt labels by searching only within the prompt class.

Support for the amendment to claim 34 may be found in the specification at paragraph [0083]: “. . . each text region that is rendered is assigned a ‘prompt type/class’. The matching of text to the pre-recorded prompt labels is done only within the specified class.” Therefore the prompt class of claim 34 is used for grouping and searching, which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Ladd.

Claims 35 and 38 have been amended to recite, similarly to claim 34, “identifying an audio segment identifier by searching only within the identified prompt class for a text string matching the received text string.”

Applicant therefore submits that claims 34, 35, and 38, and their dependents, are patentable over the cited references, and the rejections of claims 34-38 should be withdrawn.

B. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ladd et al. in view of Uppaluru and further in view of Saylor et al. (U.S. Patent: 6,501,832).

Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 36 depends from claim 35, and is patentable over the cited references for at least similar reasons as claim 35. Addition of Uppalaru and Saylor does not cure the defects of Ladd.

Further, examination of claims 39-41, which Applicant believes are pending, is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. 324212009600. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: January 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Ernest L. Ellenberger

Registration No.: 56,529
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
755 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304-1018
(650) 813-5786